

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed August 9, 2005. Responsive thereto, and to reduce the number of outstanding issues, claims 1-14 and 26-30 have been canceled hereby. As explained below, pending claims 15-25 are not anticipated by Wilson et al. on the basis of the outstanding rejections.

The differences between Wilson et al. and pending claim 15 are apparent from the following limitation:

"a plurality of elements for monitoring normal functional operation of different portions of the at least one system; and

 a common control unit coupled to the elements responsive to functional operation indicating indicia received from at least some of the elements." (pending claims 15-25)

In accordance with the above, the embodiments of the present invention include "elements for monitoring normal functional operation" for different portions of selected systems.

Unlike the claimed structures of claims 15 – 25, Wilson et al. discloses a system where no provision is made for monitoring or detecting failures. The Examiner in the Office Action has referred to Figs. 3J and 3K. As illustrated in the screen of 3K a condition has been defined which requires two digital inputs:

 "1a. East door -- Front Office n.o., Active Input; and

 3a. North Door -- Front Office n.o. active input.

When all parameters are met, will display the message:

 The Days Security System conditions were met."

The above conditions can be established using the screen of Fig. 3G of Wilson et al. However, the system of Wilson et al. has no monitoring circuitry which will provide information to the computer 12 if there is a failure of either digital input one or digital input three. For example, if the east door sensor does not indicate that the door has been opened, because a sensor

has failed, the system of Wilson et al. will not provide any messages, warnings or the like that this failure has occurred. This same lack of notification occurs if the north door sensor fails. In other words, Wilson et al. only allows the user to establish sets of conditions that are to be active during a specific time interval. If the conditions are met Wilson et al. will in turn produce the above message from Fig. 3K. This is described on Col. 16, lines 46-51 of Wilson et al. In this regard, Wilson et al. states:

"If the user would the conditional to be active during a specific time period, the user can select the Time button 170. This will allow the user to enter the time of day, as well as specific days of week during which the condition will be true, assuming all of the other parameters were met."

Similar comments appear in Col. 6, lns 25-43 of Wilson et al. as set forth in part below:

"As an example of the system's flexibility, the user could readily construct a security system which would automatically turn itself on after 10:30 p.m. and turn off after 7:00 a.m. The system would incorporate all of the typical convenience features, such as exit delays (to allow time to get out of the house before the alarm system activates) and entrance doors (to allow time to enter the house to disarm the security system). The system will further allow the user to set up specific conditions for an alarm, e.g., if a window sensor is activated (i.e. the window is opened or broken), the system will wait until a sensor is activated (such as an inside motion sensor) before the alarm is triggered...Thus, logic conditionals allow the system to require the activation of any number of sensors of any desired sequence in order to ring the alarm."(Col. 6, lns 25-43 Wilson et al.)

The outstanding anticipation rejections are deficient since as noted above, the system of Wilson et al. will not be able to detect a failure because it does not monitor the functional operation of the respective system or systems. What Wilson is indicating in Fig. 3G and Fig. 3K is that a condition can be set up requiring inputs the such as east door being opened and the north

door being opened. Wilson et al. will establish and display a message to the effect that "the Day Security System conditions were met" (Fig. 3K).

However, Wilson et al. simply does not monitor any of the sensors for normal operation. If the sensor functions and produces a signal indicating that the east door has been opened or the north door has been opened Wilson et al. can respond to that. Wilson et al. provide an indication that a predefined condition has been met on the assumption that all of the sensors thereof are working properly. However, Wilson et al. is unable to detect a failure of either the east door sensor or the north door sensor simply because it does not in any way monitor the functional operation of those sensors. This applies to the other detectors or sensors in Wilson et al.

As described above, claims 15 - 25 all require that the "plurality of elements" monitor "normal functional operation of different portions of the at least one system". Further, the common control unit which is coupled to the elements is "responsive to functional operation indicating indicia received from at least some of the elements". For at least the above reasons the pending claims are allowable.

In addition to the above reasons for allowability claim 18, for example, adds to claim 15 the following limitation:

"where the elements each periodically provide an indication of the functionality of respective portions of the at least one system."

The "claimed indication of the functionality of respective portions of the at least one system" which is provided "periodically" in claim 18 is not found in Wilson et al. Wilson et al. is completely silent in this regard. Merely opening the doors to meet a pre-defined condition does not "periodically provide an indication of the functionality of respective portions of the at least one system" (claim 8) as claimed.

Claim 22 adds the following limitation unmet by Wilson et al. to claim 15:

"instructions executable by the common control unit which respond to received indicia to evaluate functionality of respective portions of the at least one system." (pending claim 22)

Appl. No 10/714,709

Amendment B

Reply to Final Office Action mailed Aug. 9, 2005

Wilson et al. described above responds to status signals received from various sensors. However, unlike the claimed structures Wilson et al. does not incorporate the claimed "instructions executable by the common control unit which responds to receive indicia to evaluate functionality of respective portions of the at least one system." Wilson et al. is unaware of sensor failures. Claims 23, 24 and 25 add additional limitations to claim 22 which in combination are not disclosed by Wilson et al.

For at least the above reasons Wilson et al. does not anticipate pending claims 15 - 25.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested. The undersigned attorney will shortly contact the Examiner to schedule a telephone interview to discuss the pending claims and the differences therein relative to Wilson et al.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 31, 2005

By



Paul M. Vargo
Reg. No. 29,116
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312) 655-1501